

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant notes that claims 1-19 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 13-16, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 4,880,952 (US'952) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,460,630 (US'630). US'952 and US'630 do not teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 13. More specifically US'952 and US'630 do not teach where a self-cleaning layer is coated to a stainless steel plate.

Regarding US'952, column 3, lines 50-53 of the specification states "The surface of the heating chamber wall 36 facing the heating element 29 is made of a metal plate such as steel..." Furthermore, column 3, line 66 through column 4, line 2 refers to the inner surface of the heating chamber 36 being coated with an aluminum layer 39.

Regarding US'630, column 3, lines 3-5 of the specification states "When the porcelain enamel layer of a double layered enamel layer is formed on an aluminized steel sheet, in accordance with the present invention..."

Neither US'952 nor US'630 disclose or teach where the inner surface of the heating chamber for coating a self-cleaning layer is made of stainless steel. Therefore, US'952 and US'630 do not teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 13.

Applicant further notes that claims 2, 3, and 5-8 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1 and claims 14-16 and 18-19 depend on claim 13, thus all arguments pertaining to claims 1 and 13 are equally applicable to these claims and are herein incorporated by reference.

The Examiner further rejected claims 4 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

Appl. No. 10/624,169
Amdt. Dated December 6, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 8, 2004

over US'952 in view of US'630 as applied to claims 1-3, 5-8, 13-16, and 18-19 above and in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,429,161 (US'161). Applicant notes that claim 4 depends from claim 1 and claim 17 depends from claim 13, thus all arguments pertaining to claims 1 and 13 are equally applicable to claims 4 and 17 and are herein incorporated by reference.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US'952 in view of US'630 and US'161, as applied to claims 1-8 and 13-18 above, and in further view of U.S. Pat. 4,283,614 (US'614). Applicant notes that claims 9-12 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 1, thus all arguments pertaining to claim 1 are equally applicable to claims 9-12 and are herein incorporated by reference.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35919.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:


Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 6, 2004